

REMARKS

Upon entry of this Response, claims 1, 4, 12, 15, 22, and 24 will be amended and claims 3 and 14 will be canceled. Thus, claims 1-2, 4-13, and 14-25 will remain pending in the application. No new matter has been added. Reconsideration and further examination are respectfully requested in view of the following Remarks.

Claim 1 has been amended to recite determining that an interface has become available to transmit packets based on a calendar structure, wherein the first portion of the calendar structure is locally stored at a processing element and a second portion of the calendar structure is stored in memory external to the processing element. Moreover, the calendar structure comprises “a series of entry rows each being associated with a time period, each entry row including a plurality of dedicated interface availability indicators, each interface availability indicator being associated with one of a plurality interfaces and indicating whether that associated interface will transition to then become available for packet transmission during the time period associated with that row entry.”

For example, FIG. 6 of the present application illustrates a calendar structure including a locally stored portion 614 and a portion stored in an external memory 620. Moreover, the calendar structure includes row entries each associated with a time period. In this case, the “1” stored in the eleventh row of the external memory 620 indicates that the associated interface (P2) will transition to then become available for packet transmission during that time period (T_{END}). See also, for example, the Specification as originally filed at page 4, line 26.

None of the cited references disclose or suggest such a feature. Consider, for example, US Publication No. 2003/0161291 (“Kramer”). As illustrated in FIG. 4 of Kramer, a time slot table may have a number of locations (0 through N). Each location stores identifiers associated with a pair of transmission elements (e.g., identifiers for elements #1 and #2 are stored in location 0 as illustrated in FIG. 4). Thus, Kramer does not disclose or suggest entry rows associated with time periods, wherein each entry row includes “dedicated interface availability indicators” as recited in claim 1. Moreover, Kramer clearly does not disclose or suggest

availability indicators that show if a particular interface will transition to become available as is now recited in claim 1. Thus, Applicants respectfully request reconsideration and allowance of claim 1 as amended.

All of the remaining claims depend from claim 1, or recite similar limitations, and should therefore be allowable for at least the same reasons.

CONCLUSION

Accordingly, Applicants respectfully request allowance of the pending claims. If any issues remain, or if the Examiner has any further suggestions for expediting allowance of the present application, the Examiner is kindly invited to contact the undersigned via telephone at (203) 972-0191.

Respectfully submitted,

October 12, 2007
Date

/Patrick J. Buckley/
Patrick J. Buckley
Registration No. 40,928
Buckley, Maschoff & Talwalkar LLC
Attorneys for Intel Corporation
50 Locust Avenue
New Canaan, CT 06840
(203) 972-0191